

bills, well, this one is reduced that if both bills were to be enacted and signed into law by the Governor, together it would be roughly \$12 million of General Fund money. Then in addition to that you would have the federal funds. The concept in LB 525 all by itself, and, admittedly, it's different people served, that certainly is no argument, but the effect in that was putting 12 million into the health care system, generally, different distribution, different people served, but half of which was federal funds and half of which approximately were state funds. So apparently those who were outside of, from what I understood agreed to, was to try and take some of both, most of both I guess is more accurate, and then insert a lid which I'm not sure if that is an entitlement program or not, or at least I don't know who pays if the state doesn't fund it. But my real problem that I'd like to raise before I raise that issue, and I'm doing this on the assumption that it's been checked out, but we're dealing again with an A bill with substantive legislation. And there have been a number of Supreme Court...at least some Supreme Court cases in these areas. What the court has always held, to my knowledge at least, is that the substantive legislation in an appropriation to carry out the chief legislation could properly be considered one subject matter and in one bill. What cannot be done is two subjects, though. It may be a fine line, but a portion of the appropriation for the administration of this would be in the A bill and, in fact, the substantive legislation that authorizes that administration will still be in 187. And you could...you know, there is a perfect excuse not to sign this bill, if the Attorney General would rule that way, or there is the perfect excuse for someone, I suppose, to file a lawsuit, if they chose to, obviously, the benefactors wouldn't. But it's a substantive enough issue that I guess, while I disagree with the bill, Senator Lynch, as we all well know, and I haven't asked this question because I hadn't looked at this and, as you know, I just walked in now, that long before...earlier today. But I'm wondering if someone has really made reasonably certain that they do not have a constitutional problem with two subject matters. I just simple do not know. I have an alternative amendment that I had in mind. I guess my question is, if LB 187 itself was amended, obviously, there was no problem, and that could still be done tonight. If 187A is to be used, I have another alternative which I will tell you what it is, it takes the medical out.

SPEAKER BARRETT: One minute.